

Intersectionality: Multiple Inequalities in Social Theory

In the journal article *Intersectionality: Multiple Inequalities in Social Theory*, by Sylvia Walby, Jo Armstrong, and Sofia Strid, the idea of intersectionality, mostly in regards to women, is explored with critical thinking which offers solutions to the interconnected dilemmas women face daily, as well as systematically. The article is from the book *Sociology*, and the authors' goal is to find the answers to gaps regarding intersectionality with critical realism. The authors explore scholarly input from Crenshaw, McCall, and Hancock to understand commonalities between all of their arguments that could offer analysis as to why multiple inequalities take place for women. All of their arguments share inclusivity when it comes to women and disregarding generalizations put on them. However, the authors note that there are many dilemmas left unsolved, even with Crenshaw, McCall, and Hancock's input. The first problem involves figuring out how to address the relationship between structural and political intersectionality while not dismissing the other and instead focus on their connections. Structural intersectionality is when unequal social groups are taken into account, and political intersectionality regards political and systematic projects. The next dilemma asks the question, how do we address the relations between the inequalities without dismissing the powerful parts? Another problem regards balancing stability and fluidity, while the next wonders how to address class since all debates regarding intersectionality think of it differently. The authors offer solutions to each of these remaining problems, which all are similar in that they all propose that one has to isolate each issue, take away its "status," and think of all of them equally. This way, one is able to see the issues at hand more clearly and constitute a new critical way of thinking.

This source is a crucial contribution to my research because it focuses on what problems still have to be fixed, rather than listing success when it comes to intersectional thinking. By doing so, it leaves room for different perspectives and ideas to form different solutions. This is where preconceived bias can come in. With more research about bias and prejudice, I can see if this information can fill in the gaps. The solutions the authors have mentioned are more complex than I gave in my summary paragraph, one being the solution for fluidity and stability. The solution reads "The way forward is to recognize that concepts need to have their meaning temporarily stabilized at the point of analysis, even while recognizing that their social construction is the outcome of changes and interactions over time and to note the historically varied construction of these categories." This solution is critical when it comes to my research because by stabilizing the meaning of a concept, one is able to see how it naturally is. There are no preconceived opinions or subconscious biases. There can hopefully be no underlying prejudice as well. The second part of the solution states that one can still recognize that social construction has caused changes and injustices, hence preconceived judgments. If people can start seeing a corrupt concept for how it is, without bias getting in the way, they can understand how it was historically constructed, and maybe even how to dismantle it.

McCall, Leslie. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs*, vol. 30, no. 3, 2005, pp. 1771–1800. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/426800. Accessed 4 Aug. 2021.

